



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,945	03/22/2004	Yi-Lung Kuo	23724-07788	2833
758 7590 04/23/2007 FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			EXAMINER WRIGHT, INGRID D	
			ART UNIT 2835	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,945

Applicant(s)

KUO, YI-LUNG

Examiner

Ingrid Wright

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 11 and 16-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 11 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Please disregard the Advisory Action, as the previous action, mailed on 8/10/06, was a non final action. The Office apologizes and hopes that the applicant was not inconvenienced in any way.

Claim Objections

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the floppy drive and hard drive interchangeably stacked must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2835

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8,11,16,18,21,24 & 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yu US 6437977 B1.

Claim 8, Yu teaches a method of installing a plurality of computer drives (col. 2, lines 9-22 of Yu) within a computer chassis (Abstract and chassis of fig. 2), the method comprising: securing a first computer drive (HDD) to a mounting structure (20) comprising a base panel (bottom panel of (20), fig. 2), two side panels (opposite side walls of (20), fig. 2), and a flange (protruding portions of (20), fig. 2) bordering each side panel (fig. 2), wherein the connection between each side panel (fig. 2) and its corresponding flange (fig. 2) is substantially parallel to the connection between the side panel (fig. 2) and the base panel (fig. 2); placing the mounting structure (20) and first computer drive (HDD) in the computer chassis (chassis of fig. 2) through an opening (fig. 2) in a top side of the computer chassis (fig. 2); securing a second computer drive (FDD) to the mounting structure (20); and securing the mounting structure (20) to the computer chassis (fig. 2).

Claim 11, Yu teaches wherein the first and second computer drives, (HDD,FDD), are of different sizes,

Claim 16, Yu teaches wherein the method further comprises, subsequent to securing the mounting structure (20) to the computer chassis (fig. 2): removing the mounting structure (20) through the opening (opening illustrated on fig. 2 of Yu) in the top side of the computer chassis (fig. 2); and removing at least one of the first and second computer drives (HDD,FDD) from the mounting structure (20).

Claim 18, Yu teaches securing the first computer drive (HDD) within the mounting structure (20), and securing the second computer drive (FDD) outside the mounting structure (20).

Claim 21, Yu teaches securing the second computer drive (FDD) to the mounting structure (20) is performed, prior to placing the mounting structure (20) and first computer drive (HDD) through the opening (shown on fig. 1) in the top side (fig. 2) of the computer chassis (fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2835

Claim 24, Yu teaches securing a computer component (FDD) to the mounting structure (20).

Claim 28, Yu teaches accessing the mounting structure (20) through the opening (fig. 2) in the top of the chassis (fig. 2).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20, 22 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu US 6437977 B1 in view of Chen US 6375288 B1.

Claim 20, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 & 19 above, Yu teaches drives (HDD,FDD), but is silent as to a CD-ROM. Chen teaches a conventional configuration, including a plurality of drives, and specifically a CD-ROM, attached to a drive bracket. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a CD-ROM as taught, by Chen, in the invention of Yu, in order to provide a conventional configuration for the computer of Yu, whereby storage devices are attached to the drive bracket (20).

Claim 22, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 above, Yu teaches securing the mounting structure (20) to the computer chassis (fig. 2) and tabs (21), but is silent as to securing the mounting structure (20) to the chassis, via tabs. Chen teaches a mounting structure secured by placing a tab (220) within a hollow space (58,79), fitted to receive the tab (220). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the tabs of Chen in the invention of Yu, in order to provide a stronger locking support for the flanges of Yu to the chassis (fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2835

Claim 23, Yu in view of Chen, teaches the mounting structure (20), being secured to the chassis (fig. 2), via tabs.

5. Claims 17,19,25 & 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu US 6437977 B1.

Claim 17, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 above, Yu teaches a computer system component (FDD) installed in the computer chassis at a location below the mounting structure (20), but is silent as to as to the component (FDD) installed at a location above the mounting structure (20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the FDD above the mounting structure (20), in order to provide an alternate stacked configuration of storage devices.

Official Notice is taken, in regards to a second component mounted on top of a first component. Coffin et al. US 7036132 B1 teaches a second device (36) mounted at a location (28) above a first device (34), within a chassis or housing.

Claim 19, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 & 18 above, Yu teaches securing the second computer drive (FDD), but is silent as to securing the second drive on top of the mounting structure (20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount and secure the FDD above the mounting structure (20), in order to provide an alternate stacked configuration of storage devices.

Official Notice is taken, in regards to a second component mounted on top of a first component. Coffin et al. US 7036132 B1 teaches a second device (36) mounted at a location (28) above a first device (34), within a chassis or housing.

Claim 25, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 & 24 above, Yu teaches computer components (HDD,FDD), but is silent specifically as to a card reader. It would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2835

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a card reader in the computer of Yu, since card reader are conventionally known to be installed in computer systems.

Official Notice is taken, in regards to a second component mounted on top of a first component, which includes a card reader (34). Coffin et al. US 7036132 B1 teaches a second device (36) mounted at a location (28) above a first device (34), within a chassis or housing.

Claim 26, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 above, Yu teaches wherein the mounting structure (20) is capable of receiving a HDD and FDD stacked on each other, but is silent specifically as being interchangeably stacked on each other. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize interchangeably stack the HDD and FDD over the configuration of Yu, in order to provide an alternate stacked configuration suitable to a user when utilizing the computer.

Official Notice is taken, in regards to a second component interchangeably mounted on top of a first component. Coffin et al. US 7036132 B1 teaches a second device (36), interchangeably mounted at a location (28) above a first device (34), within a computer housing.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu US 6437977 B1 in view of Brooks et al. US 6388873 B1.

Claim 27, in regards to all the limitations of claim 8 above, Yu teaches a chassis, but is silent specifically as to a small form factor computer. Brooks et al. teaches a small form factor chassis, for allowing a hard drive to conform to a selected exterior size and shape, without decreasing the capacity of the hard drive (col. 1, lines 34-40 of Brooks et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the form factor configuration as taught by Brooks et al., for the chassis of Yu, in order to allow the size of the disk drive of Yu, to conform to a standard size and shape, without decreasing the capacity of the HDD.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8,11& 16-28, filed on 11/13/06, have been considered. New limitations presented in the claims (in addition to new claims), filed on 11/13/06, have changed the scope of the claims, and in order to speed the prosecution of the instant application, a new search was conducted. New prior art, Yu US 6437977 B1, Chen 6375288 B1 & Brooks et al. US 6388873 B1 are now applied to the claims. Thus, Chen (US 6685286), will not be used to meet the limitations of the claims, and arguments presented on 11/13/06, regarding Chen, are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ingrid Wright whose telephone number is (571)272-8392. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash Gandhi can be reached on (571)272-2800, ext 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or

Art Unit: 2835

Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IDW



**LISA LEA-EDMONDS
PRIMARY EXAMINER**